DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 461 114 CS 216 348

TITLE	Draft Framework for Initial Licensure of Professional Educators in the State of Indiana.
INSTITUTION	Indiana State Dept. of Education, Indianapolis. Professional Standards Board.
PUB DATE	1998-06-17
NOTE	19p.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Early Childhood Education; Educational Certificates; Elementary Secondary Education; Fine Arts; Higher Education; Language Arts; Mathematics Instruction; *Professional Development; Science Instruction; Second Language Learning; Social Studies; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Competencies; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Indiana

ABSTRACT

Another step in the process of teacher education reform under the leadership of the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB), this paper presents the draft framework for the initial licensure of professional educators in the state of Indiana. The preface discusses the composition of the committee, the process, selections, the "house" metaphor, parameters, planning assumptions, appearance of the new license, content areas for the new license, bases of the framework, additional recommendations, and the dissemination process. The paper then presents the licensure committee charge and then the recommended framework for initial licensure in each content area (building level administrator, English as a new language, exceptional needs, fine arts, foreign language, generalist, health/physical education, language arts, library media, mathematics, science, social studies, and vocational/career education). A list of unresolved issues to revisit and recommended items for consideration by the standards review committee are attached. (RS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

I P S B

INDIANA PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD

ED 401 114

JUNE 17, 1998

DRAFT FRAMEWORK

FOR

INITIAL LICENSURE

OF

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS

IN THE

STATE OF INDIANA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
E. Holland
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

1

SUBMITTED BY THE
LICENSURE COMMITTEE OF THE
Indiana PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD

CS216348

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

251 East Ohio Street . Suite 201 . Indianapolis, IN 46204-2133
317/232-9010 . FAX 317/232-9023

Table of Contents

Preface	3
Introduction	3
The Charge	3
Composition of the Committee	4
The Process	5
Selections	6
The IPSB "House" Metaphor	6
Parameters	7
Planning Assumptions	8
Appearance of the New License	8
Content Areas for the New License	9
Bases for the Framework	9
Additional Recommendations	9
Dissemination Process	10
Conclusion	11
Licensure Committee Charge	11
-The Charge	
-The Framework	
-Real World Applicability Criteria	
Recommended Framework for Initial Licensure in Each Content Area	13
Additional Recommendations	17
Licensure Committee: Unresolved Issues To Revisit Next Year	18
Standards Review Cycle Committee: Recommended Items For Consideration	18

PREFACE

to the

Draft Framework

for

Initial Licensure of Professional Educators

in the

State of Indiana

Created by the
Licensure Committee of the Indiana Professional Standards Board
June 17, 1998

Introduction

The *Draft Framework for Initial Licensure of Professional Educators in the State of Indiana* is another important step in the process of teacher education reform under the leadership of the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB). The chronological plan of the IPSB has been to develop content area and developmental level standards first, an assessment plan second, a framework for licensure third, and finally promulgation of the entire package.

The Charge

The Licensure Committee of the Indiana Professional Standards Board was charged with "recommending a framework for licensing professional educators and for testing the framework against the standards for preparation and licensure and for real world applicability." It was further suggested that reducing the number of

licenses available and streamlining the licensure process would also be desirable outcomes, if possible. (The full Charge, including specific instructions on the framework and real world applicability criteria, is printed on page eleven.)

Composition of the Committee

The members of the Licensure Committee were selected to represent the stakeholders in the process. All Licensure Committee members, with the logical exception of the outside facilitator, had served on at least one content area or developmental level advisory group. The names of Licensure Committee members are listed below, including place of employment, community, and designated area represented on the Committee. The Committee selected Jeffrey Doebler to serve as chair and Kathleen Klawitter to serve as recorder. James Fleck was engaged by the IPSB to act as facilitator.

William Christopher, Student Assistance Commission, Indianapolis, state governmental representative

Lewis Ciminillo, Indiana University Northwest, Gary, IPSB member representing higher education

Jeffrey Doebler, Chair, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, representing higher education

James Fleck, Facilitator, Fleck Leadership Center, Columbia City

Barbara Horvath, Monroe County Community School Corporation, Bloomington, representing specialty content areas (vocational education, exceptional needs, library/media)

Kathleen Lattimer, North Central High School, Indianapolis, representing elective content areas (fine arts, physical education, foreign language, health)

David Kinman, Indiana University, Bloomington, representing higher education and licensing advisors

Kathleen Klawitter, Recorder, Northeast Dubois County School Corporation, Dubois, representing elementary educators

Phil Metcalf, Wawasee High School, Syracuse, IPSB Chair

Elaine Pitts, Gavit Middle School, Hammond, representing core content areas (mathematics, science, social studies, language arts)

James Renz, Greencastle Community School Corporation, Greencastle, representing administration/student services

Elizabeth Schurtz, Indiana Professional Standards Board, Indianapolis, IPSB Licensing Director

The Process

During June, 1997, the Licensure Committee met in Indianapolis for two days of recognition, introduction and training. The Committee has met eight times since then. In addition to individual data gathering and group discussion within the Committee, invitations to give expert testimony were extended to each of the content area and developmental level advisory groups. Other stakeholder groups also asked and were welcomed to present expert testimony. Representatives from the following groups presented formal testimony to the Licensure Committee in written and/or verbal form:

Adolescence/Young Adulthood
Building Level Administrators
Business
Early Adolescence
Exceptional Needs
Fine Arts
Foreign Language
IPSB Senior Staff
Journalism
Language Arts
Library/Media
Mathematics
Physical Education/Health
Social Studies
Vocational Education

Selections

Again following the model used by the IPSB developmental level and content area advisory groups, the Licensure Committee recorder, Kathleen Klawitter, provided *Selections* as a record of each meeting. The Selections were not meant to serve as "minutes," but rather to document important discussion and decisions.

The IPSB "House" Metaphor

The Licensure Committee maintained the IPSB's "house" metaphor for redesigning teacher preparation in Indiana. The Foundation represents preparation, induction, and continuing education. The First Floor represents education standards, including the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) core principles, IPSB content area and developmental level standards, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) certification areas. Also included are these components for building a licensure framework:

Developmental Areas

(1) EARLY CHILDHOOD, ages 3-8
(2) MIDDLE CHILDHOOD, ages 7-12
(3) EARLY ADOLESCENCE , ages 11-15
(4) ADOLESCENCE & YOUNG ADULTHOOD, ages 14-18+

Content Areas

(1) Generalist
(2) Art
(3) English as a New Language
(4) English Language Arts
(5) Exceptional Needs
(6) Foreign Language
(7) Health
(8) Library Media
(9) Mathematics
(10) Music
(11) Physical Education
(12) Science
(13) Social Studies
(14) Theater
(15) Vocational Education

Other Areas

(1) Building Level Administrators
(2) Corporation Administrators (to be addressed at a later date)
(3) School Services (to be addressed at a later date)

The Second Floor represents assessment of standards, including the IPSB Ten Principles of Assessment and the Continuum Linkage Committee (CLC) recommendations. The Third Floor represents licensure and the Roof represents promulgation (rules).

Parameters

Considering the information above, the Licensure Committee articulated what they considered to be non-negotiable parameters of the IPSB:

(A) The Licensure Committee is not charged with altering the content area or developmental level standards created by the advisory groups appointed by the IPSB.

(B) The Licensure Committee is not charged with assessment of the content area or developmental level standards created by the advisory groups appointed by the IPSB.

(C) The Licensure Committee is not charged with developing a framework for license renewal.

(D) The developmental levels adopted by the IPSB are:
-EARLY CHILDHOOD, ages 3-8
-MIDDLE CHILDHOOD, ages 7-12
-EARLY ADOLESCENCE , ages 11-15
-ADOLESCENCE & YOUNG ADULTHOOD, ages 14-18+

(E) All teacher candidates must meet the INTASC Standards. ←

Planning Assumptions

To aid the process of discussion and consideration, the Licensure Committee developed the following planning assumptions:

(A) Educators will be prepared to teach all learners.

(B) Literacy and Technology are a part of all content areas.

(C) Gifted and Talented education is considered part of the Mild and Intense Intervention sections of Exceptional Needs and is embedded in content areas.

(D) There will be one professional educator license, with a minimum of one developmental level and one content area. In other words, one content area and one developmental level will represent the minimal requirements for initial licensure.

(E) Teacher candidates and institutions of higher education recognize the marketability of multiple developmental levels and/or content areas.

Appearance of the New License

One of the first issues to be resolved was the format or appearance of the new license. The Committee recommends that there be only one Professional Educator License. Then, in addition to the appropriate signatures, seals and so forth, the type of license would be indicated (in this case "Initial"), and the developmental level(s) and the content area(s) for which the candidate has demonstrated proficiency. The minimum would be one content area and one developmental level, but the Committee, concurring with the Adolescence/Young Adulthood and Early Adolescence Advisory Groups, recommends two or more content areas, where feasible. The Committee's further assumption is that institutions, individuals, and the marketplace will determine programs for individual teacher candidates.

Content Areas for the New License

The content areas listed here are found in the draft framework recommendations. The groupings and numbering differ slightly from page six because art, music and theater are included under Fine Arts, health and physical education are organized together, and English Language Arts has been renamed Language Arts. The developmental levels are as listed on pages six and seven.

Content Areas for Draft Framework of Initial License

(1) BUILDING LEVEL ADMINISTRATOR
(2) ENGLISH AS A NEW LANGUAGE
(3) EXCEPTIONAL NEEDS
(4) FINE ARTS (music, visual arts, theater arts, dance)
(5) FOREIGN LANGUAGE
(6) GENERALIST
(7) HEALTH/PHYSICAL EDUCATION
(8) LANGUAGE ARTS
(9) LIBRARY MEDIA
(10) MATHEMATICS
(11) SCIENCE
(12) SOCIAL STUDIES
(13) VOCATIONAL/CAREER EDUCATION

Bases for the Framework

The draft framework, then, is based on the non-negotiable parameters set by the IPSB, expert testimony, recommendations of the advisory groups, and, most importantly, the IPSB-approved standards that have been developed to date.

Additional Recommendations

The Licensure Committee recognizes that several areas need further review, consideration and clarification. It is recommended that the Committee continue its work for another year and that two positions be added: one representative each for school services and vocational/career education.

In the recommendations at the end of the Draft Framework, there are two lists of items identified by Licensure Committee for further consideration. Most of these items are "real world applicability" issues, such as reciprocity. The first list contains items for the Licensure Committee agenda. The second list includes items that are beyond the purview of the Licensure Committee, many of which were suggested during expert testimony. It is recommended that these items be referred to the Standards Review Cycle Committee for consideration.

Of particular note in the recommendations are the age groupings for the developmental levels set by the IPSB, as well as whether the ages should overlap between developmental levels. Serious concern was voiced by representatives of the Early Adolescence Advisory Group that the age groupings and overlaps are inappropriate and may indeed be a step "backward" in the redesign of Indiana teacher preparation: The age levels were those recommended by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards for certification of experienced teachers. They may not be applicable for initial licensure of teachers in Indiana. *Should recommendations to alter the age ranges of the developmental standards be added to the Licensure Committee Charge for the upcoming academic year, the Licensure Committee would likely make this issue a top priority for its next meeting. In this way, a recommendation might be made to the IPSB in the fall.*

Another important note is the lack of content standards for the Generalist (early and middle childhood). Licensure Committee consensus was that the Generalist content standards are included in each of the content area and developmental level standards, but that the standards pertaining specifically to the Generalist need to be put into one Generalist content standards document.

Dissemination Process

The Licensure Committee recommends a dissemination process similar to that used for the advisory group standards. In addition to the group of stakeholders identified at that time, each advisory group (all members) should receive a copy for consideration. A suggested timeline is as follows:

June '98 Presentation to IPSB

July '98 - October '98	Dissemination and public feedback
November '98	Licensure Committee Edit Team edit as necessary
January '99	IPSB discussion and ratification

Conclusion

Members of the Licensure Committee have taken their charge very seriously and have found the process to be extremely rewarding professionally. They would like to express their sincere appreciation to the IPSB and to all of the stakeholders for the privilege of serving the profession in this manner. Members of the Licensure Committee look forward to continuing their work through the upcoming academic year.

LICENSURE COMMITTEE CHARGE

I. The Charge

The Licensure Committee is responsible for recommending a framework for licensing professional educators and for testing the framework against the standards for preparation and licensure and for real world applicability.

II. The Framework

The framework must be congruent with non-negotiables consisting of:

A. The Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) System for Redesign (The House).

B. Standards (Floor 1)
-The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) core principles;
-The IPSB content and developmental standards and Components for Building a Licensure Framework; and
-The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) certification areas.

C. Assessments (Floor 2)
-The IPSB Ten Principles of Assessment; and
-The Continuum Linkage Committee recommendations (subject to IPSB approval).

III. Real World Applicability Criteria

The framework will:

-Accommodate the needs of a mobile society by facilitating reciprocity among the states.
-Be written in clear concise language.
-Provide a reasonable transition process that is sensitive to the needs of all future and current education professionals.
-Address the issue of the generalist and the specialist.
-Accommodate the needs of career changers.
-Be implemented easily.
-Create a valued marketable license.
-Provide sufficient flexibility to manage emergency staffing issues.
-Promote professional pride and personal commitment among educators.

RECOMMENDED FRAMEWORK FOR INITIAL LICENSURE IN EACH CONTENT AREA

(Listed in alphabetical order, as on page nine.)

(1) BUILDING LEVEL ADMINISTRATOR

Developmental Level(s): one or more

Content: Building Level Administrator, based on the IPSB Standards

Comment: The standards ensure that administrators will be well-versed in the curriculum, pedagogy, and student characteristics of the developmental level or levels for the school in which they serve.

(2) ENGLISH AS A NEW LANGUAGE

Developmental Level(s): one or more

Content: English as a New Language, based on the IPSB Standards

(3) EXCEPTIONAL NEEDS

Developmental Level(s): one or more

Content: Exceptional Needs: Mild Intervention, based on the IPSB Standards

Exceptional Needs: Intense Intervention, based on the IPSB Standards

Exceptional Needs: Visually Impaired, based on the IPSB Standards

Exceptional Needs: Hearing Impaired, based on the IPSB Standards

Comment: The content standards for Mild and Intense Intervention are based on levels of service needed rather than discrete categories.

(4) FINE ARTS

Developmental Level(s): one or more

Content: Fine Arts: Visual Arts, based on the IPSB Standards

Fine Arts: Vocal and General Music, based on the IPSB Standards

Fine Arts: Instrumental and General Music, based on the IPSB Standards

Fine Arts: Theater Arts, based on the IPSB Standards

Fine Arts: Dance, based on the IPSB Standards

Comment: The standards clearly define each of the fine arts (music, visual arts, theater arts and dance) as a discrete discipline.

(5) FOREIGN LANGUAGE

Developmental Level(s): one or more

Content: Foreign Language: [specific language], based on the IPSB Standards

(6) GENERALIST

Developmental Level(s): EARLY CHILDHOOD and/or MIDDLECHILDHOOD

Content: Generalist, to be taken from other content standards.

Comment: Early and middle childhood educators need a broad base of knowledge across content areas. The standards to be met are currently found in each of the content areas and developmental levels.

(7) HEALTH/PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Developmental Level(s): one or more

Content: Health/Physical Education: Health, based on the IPSB Standards

Health/Physical Education: Physical Education, based on the IPSB Standards

Comment: The standards clearly define health and physical education as discrete disciplines.

(8) LANGUAGE ARTS

Developmental Level(s): one or more

Content: Language Arts: Language Arts, based on the IPSB Standards

Comment: The standards are comprehensive, encompassing reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing and enactment.

(9) LIBRARY MEDIA

Developmental Level(s): one or more

Content: Library Media, based on the IPSB Standards

(10) MATHEMATICS

Developmental Level(s): one or more

Content: Mathematics, based on the IPSB Standards

(11) SCIENCE

Developmental Level(s): one or more

Content: Science: Life Sciences, based on the IPSB Standards

Science: Physical Sciences, based on the IPSB Standards

Science: Earth/Space Sciences, based on the IPSB Standards

Comment: The standards clearly define life, physical and earth/space sciences as discrete disciplines.

(12) SOCIAL STUDIES

Developmental Level(s): one or more

Content: Social Studies, based on the IPSB Standards

Comment: The standards are comprehensive, encompassing nine strands within the field.

(13) VOCATIONAL/CAREER EDUCATION

Developmental Level(s): one or more

Content: Vocational/Career Education, based on the IPSB Standards

Comment: The licensure recommendation reflects the standards that have been developed to date.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The Licensure Committee recognizes that several areas need further review, consideration and clarification. It is recommended that the Committee continue its work for another year and that one representative each of school services and vocational/career education be added to the Committee.

The two lists below represent the Licensure Committee's identification of areas in need of further consideration. The first list contains items for the Licensure Committee agenda. List two contains items that are beyond the purview of the Licensure Committee. Many of these items were suggested during expert testimony. It is recommended that these items be referred to the Standards Review Cycle Committee for consideration.

LICENSURE COMMITTEE: UNRESOLVED ISSUES TO REVISIT NEXT YEAR (in no particular order–numbers are used simply for ease of identification)

1. Designated ages for developmental levels
2. District level administrators
3. Emergency staffing issues
4. License reciprocity and transfer
5. Limited licenses
6. School services
7. Speech and language disorders
8. Substitute licenses
9. Teaching minors and endorsements
10. Vocational/career education

STANDARDS REVIEW CYCLE COMMITTEE: RECOMMENDED ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION (in no particular order–numbers are used simply for ease of identification)

1. Computer and/or technology specialists
2. Consider creating strands within the Language Arts content standards for journalism, speech, debate, and/or student publications
3. Content standards for agricultural science & business
4. Content standards for business
5. Content standards for family and consumer science
6. Generalist as a content area
7. Occupational or trades specialists
8. Revisit the theater and dance portions of the Fine Arts standards to be sure they are appropriate